



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,472	01/21/2004	Joan Evelyn Conover	SAIC0008-CON1	2030
27510	7590	03/28/2006	EXAMINER	
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP 607 14TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PHAM, HUNG Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2168	

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/760,472

Applicant(s)

CONOVER ET AL.

Examiner

HUNG Q. PHAM

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33,34 and 36-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 35 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 031806.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

The previous Restriction/Election 12/21/05 and Office Action 02/21/2006 are moot in view of the new pending claims 33-49 as filed on 01/21/04.

#### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

**Claims 35, 42 and 46 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, 7 and 8, of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,314. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.**

Art Unit: 2168

**APPLICATION 10/760,472**

Claim 33. A system for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories, the system comprising:

a scanning tool for scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords for the documents located therein;

a keyword index to the documents built using the collected keywords;

a mapping tool for mapping the documents using the keyword index to one or more classes, each of the one or more classes including keywords representative of that class; and

a computing device for  
creating metadata indicative of each of the documents and

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index,

wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date.

Claim 34. The system according to claim 33, wherein the meta-index retains characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index.

Claim 35. The system according to claim 34, wherein the characteristics of the multiple heterogeneous repositories are transparent to the user

**PATENT 6,701,314**

Claim 1. A system for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories, the system comprising:

a scanning tool for scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords for the documents located therein;

a keyword index to the documents built using the collected keywords;

a mapping tool for mapping the documents using the keyword index to one or more classes, each of the one or more classes including keywords representative of that class; and

a computing device for  
creating metadata indicative of each of the documents as defined by each of the documents' keywords and one or more classes and

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index,

wherein the meta-index retains the characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index; and further wherein the characteristics of the multiple heterogeneous repositories are transparent to the user when one or more of the documents are

Art Unit: 2168

when one or more of the documents are accessed using the meta-index.

Claim 42. A method for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories, comprising:

scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords from the documents located therein;

building a keyword index to the documents stored in the multiple heterogeneous repositories using the collected keywords;

mapping the documents using the keyword index into predetermined classes, wherein the mapping is performed using at least one mapping tool;

creating metadata information, including identification of the predetermined class, for the documents; and

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index,

wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes: a universal resource locator, a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date and further

wherein the meta-index retains the characteristics

accessed using the meta-index.

Claim 8. The method of claim 6, wherein the metadata information is stored in the eXtensible Markup Language (XML) format.

Claim 6. A method for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories, comprising:

scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords from the documents located therein;

building a keyword index to the documents stored in the multiple heterogeneous repositories using the collected keywords;

mapping the documents using the keyword index into predetermined classes, wherein the mapping is performed using at least one mapping tool;

creating metadata information, including identification of the predetermined class, for the documents; and

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index,

wherein the meta-index retains the characteristics of

Art Unit: 2168

of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index.

Claim 46. A method for automatically cataloguing documents located on at least a first and second website, comprising:

scanning the at least a first and second website to collect keywords from the documents located therein, wherein documents located on a first website are in a first format and documents located on a second website are in a second format;

building a keyword index to the documents stored on the at least a first and second website using the collected keywords;

mapping the documents using the keyword index into predetermined classes, wherein the mapping is performed using at least one mapping tool;

creating metadata information, including identification of the predetermined class, for the documents; and

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index,

wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a third format and further wherein the meta-index retains the first format and the second format, respectively, for the documents in each of the at least a first and second websites such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the at least a first and second website

each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index.

Claim 8. The method of claim 6, wherein the metadata information is stored in the eXtensible Markup Language (XML) format.

Claim 6. A method for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories, comprising:

scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords from the documents located therein;

building a keyword index to the documents stored in the multiple heterogeneous repositories using the collected keywords;

mapping the documents using the keyword index into predetermined classes, wherein the mapping is performed using at least one mapping tool;

creating metadata information, including identification of the predetermined class, for the documents; and

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index,

wherein the meta-index retains the characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index.

utilizing the meta-index.	<p>Claim 7. The method of claim 6, wherein scanning the at least one information repository to collect keywords is performed by a spider.</p> <p>Claim 8. The method of claim 6, wherein the metadata information is stored in the eXtensible Markup Language (XML) format.</p>
---------------------------	---

Claims 35 and 42 of the current application are obvious over claims 1, 6 and 8 of USP 6,701,314 because XML format as in claim 8 of USP 6,701,314 is a predefined data structure for storing metadata, obviously comprises *at least one of the following attributes a universal resource locator, a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date* as recited in claim 1 of USP 6,701,314, *metadata indicative of each of the documents as defined by each of the documents' keywords.*

Claim 46 of the current application is obvious over claims 6-8 of USP 6,701,314 because via a spider, *documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories* are web pages of web sites in a variety of formats, e.g., HTML, XML, PDF...

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2168

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Claims 33, 34, 36-40 and 42-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marques [USP 6,182,066] in view of Teare et al. [USP 6,151,624].**

Regarding claim 33, Marques teaches *a system for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories* (Marques, Abstract), the system comprising: *a scanning tool for scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords for the documents located therein* (Crawler is used to seek out the documents from external and internal sources as shown in FIG. 2 via word searching (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34). As seen, crawler *a scanning tool for scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories, e.g., external and internal sources of FIG. 2, and the purpose is to collect keywords for the documents located therein* (Marques, Col. 5, Lines 46-65));



Art Unit: 2168

*a keyword index to the documents built using the collected keywords* (Content of collected document are tokenized into term string and replaced by 32 bit integers, and mapped to an entry of vector as *a keyword index to the documents* (Marques, Col. 5, Line 46-Col. 6, Line 7));

*a mapping tool for mapping the documents using the keyword index to one or more classes, each of the one or more classes including keywords representative of that class* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56, Col. 6, Lines 6-7 and 13-22 and Col. 7, Lines 51-55).

The missing of Marques' system is *a computing device for creating metadata indicative of each of the documents and cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index, wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date.*

Teare teach a mechanism for associating metadata with network resources (Teare, Abstract). Teare further discloses *a computing device for*

*creating metadata indicative of each of the documents* (Teare, FIG. 1A and Col. 6, Lines 10-24, *metadata* associated with a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is defined and stored in Name File 64, e.g., FIG. 1A),

*cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index* (As shown in FIG. 1A (Col. 7, Lines 1-15), *metadata* associated with a Web page includes real name of the resource, URL and a description value. Real name, URL and the descriptive information are loaded into Registry 10 (Col. 9, Lines 21-22). Index 30 associates with Registry 10 and comprises Index Files 34 that contain

Art Unit: 2168

an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64 (Col. 10, Lines 5-1). As seen, a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is listed or catalogued *in an integrated library*, e.g., Registry 10, *according to the metadata in a meta-index*, e.g., Index Files contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64),

*wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date* (As discussed above, *metadata for each of the documents*, e.g., Real Name, URL and description value, is *indexed within the meta-index*, e.g., Index Files. The metadata includes URL is stored in XML or RDF format (FIG. 1A, Col. 6, Lines 26-39). In other words, *the metadata for each of the documents is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date*).

Metadata mechanism as taught by Teare is a must for the Marques system because metadata as disclosed by Marques at Col. 3, Lines 45-57 will be more relevant to a network resource if it is defined by network resource's author. By including the Teare metadata mechanism, metadata as disclosed by Marques will be updated corresponding to the updated network resource by indexing and storing metadata in a database.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include metadata mechanism as taught by Teare in order to have a more relevant metadata for a network resource, and via this metadata

Art Unit: 2168

mechanism, metadata will be updated corresponding to the updated network resource.

Regarding claim 42, Marques teaches *a method for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories* (Marques, Abstract), comprising:

*scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords from the documents located therein* (Crawler is used to seek out the documents from external and internal sources as shown in FIG. 2 via word searching (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34). As seen, crawler a scanning tool for *scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories*, e.g., external and internal sources of FIG. 2, and the purpose is *to collect keywords for the documents located therein* (Marques, Col. 5, Lines 46-65));

*building a keyword index to the documents stored in the multiple heterogeneous repositories using the collected keywords* (Content of collected document are tokenized into term string and replaced by 32 bit integers, and mapped to an entry of vector as *a keyword index to the documents stored in the multiple heterogeneous repositories using the collected keywords* (Marques, Col. 5, Line 46-Col. 6, Line 7));

*mapping the documents using the keyword index into predetermined classes, wherein the mapping is performed using at least one mapping tool* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56, Col. 6, Lines 6-7 and 13-22 and Col. 7, Lines 51-55);

*creating identification of the predetermined class* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-57).

The missing of Marques method is the step of *creating metadata information for the documents; and cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index, wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined*

Art Unit: 2168

*data structure including at least one of the following attributes a universal resource locator, a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date and further wherein the meta-index retains the characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index.*

Teare teach a mechanism for associating metadata with network resources (Teare, Abstract). Teare further discloses the step of

*creating metadata for the documents* (Teare, FIG. 1A and Col. 6, Lines 10-24, *metadata associated with a document or network resource, e.g., Web page, is defined and stored in Name File 64, e.g., FIG. 1A),*

*cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index* (As shown in FIG. 1A (Col. 7, Lines 1-15), metadata associated with a Web page includes real name of the resource, URL and a description value. Real name, URL and the descriptive information are loaded into Registry 10 (Col. 9, Lines 21-22). Index 30 associates with Registry 10 and comprises Index Files 34 that contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64 (Col. 10, Lines 5-1). As seen, a *document or network resource, e.g., Web page, is listed or catalogued in an integrated library, e.g., Registry 10, according to the metadata in a meta-index, e.g., Index Files contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64),*

*wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a universal resource locator, a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date* (As discussed above, *metadata for each of the documents , e.g., Real Name, URL and description value, is indexed within the meta-index, e.g., Index Files. The metadata*

Art Unit: 2168

includes URL is stored in XML or RDF format (FIG. 1A, Col. 6, Lines 26-39). In other words, *the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a universal resource locator, a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date*);

*wherein the meta-index retains the characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents* (Teare, Col. 10, Lines 5-21) *such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index* (Teare, Col. 21, Line 39-Col. 22, Lines 40).

Metadata mechanism as taught by Teare is a must for the Marques system because metadata as disclosed by Marques at Col. 3, Lines 45-57 will be more relevant to a network resource if it is defined by network resource's author. By including the Teare metadata mechanism, metadata as disclosed by Marques will be updated corresponding to the updated network resource by indexing and storing metadata in a database.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include metadata technique as taught by Teare in order to have a more relevant metadata for a network resource, and via this metadata mechanism, metadata will be updated corresponding to the updated network resource.

Regarding claim 46, Marques teaches *a method for automatically cataloguing documents located on at least a first and second website* (Marques, Abstract), comprising:

*scanning the at least a first and second website to collect keywords from the documents located therein, wherein documents located on a first website are in a first format and documents located on a second website are in a second format* (Crawler is used to seek out the documents from Web sites as shown in FIG. 2 via word searching (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34). The documents are in different format (Col. 3, Lines 45-57). As seen, crawler a scanning tool for *scanning the at least a first and second website to collect keywords from the documents located therein, and the purpose is to collect keywords for the documents located therein* (Marques, Col. 5, Lines 46-65), *documents located on a first website are in a first format and documents located on a second website are in a second format, e.g., PCFile, FTP at Col. 3, Lines 45-57);*

*building a keyword index to the documents stored on the at least a first and second website using the collected keywords* (Content of collected document are tokenized into term string and replaced by 32 bit integers, and mapped to an entry of vector as *a keyword index to the documents stored on the at least a first and second website using the collected keywords* (Marques, Col. 5, Line 46-Col. 6, Line 7));

*mapping the documents using the keyword index into predetermined classes, wherein the mapping is performed using at least one mapping tool* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56, Col. 6, Lines 6-7 and 13-22 and Col. 7, Lines 51-55).

*creating identification of the predetermined class* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-57).

The missing of Marques method is the step of *creating metadata information for the documents; and cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index, wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a third format and further wherein the meta-index retains the first format and the second format, respectively, for the documents in each of the at least a first and second websites such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the at least a first and second website utilizing the meta-index.*

Teare teach a mechanism for associating metadata with network resources (Teare, Abstract). Teare further discloses the step of

*creating metadata information for the documents* (Teare, FIG. 1A and Col. 6, Lines 10-24, *metadata* associated with a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is defined and stored in Name File 64, e.g., FIG. 1A),

*cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index* (As shown in FIG. 1A (Col. 7, Lines 1-15), metadata associated with a Web page includes real name of the resource, URL and a description value. Real name, URL and the descriptive information are loaded into Registry 10 (Col. 9, Lines 21-22). Index 30 associates with Registry 10 and comprises Index Files 34 that contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64 (Col. 10, Lines 5-1). As seen, a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is listed or catalogued *in an integrated library*, e.g., Registry 10, *according to the metadata in a meta-index*, e.g., Index Files contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64),

*wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a third format* (As discussed above, *metadata for each of the documents*, e.g., Real Name, URL and description value, is *indexed within the meta-index*, e.g., Index Files. The metadata is stored in XML or RDF format (FIG. 1A, Col. 6, Lines 26-39). In other words, *the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a third format*);

*wherein the meta-index retains the first format and the second format, respectively, for the documents in each of the at least a first and second websites* (Teare, Col. 10, Lines 5-21) *such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the at least a first and second website utilizing the meta-index* (Teare, Col. 21, Line 39-Col. 22, Lines 40).

Metadata mechanism as taught by Teare is a must for the Marques system because metadata as disclosed by Marques at Col. 3, Lines 45-57 will be more relevant to a network resource if it is defined by network resource's author. By including the Teare metadata mechanism, metadata as disclosed by Marques will be updated corresponding to the updated network resource by indexing and storing metadata in a database.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include metadata technique as taught by Teare in order to have a more relevant metadata for a network resource, and via this metadata mechanism, metadata will be updated corresponding to the updated network resource.

Regarding claim 34, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 33, Teare further discloses *the meta-index retains characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents* (Teare, Col. 10, Lines 5-21) *such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index* (Teare, Col. 21, Line 39-Col. 22, Lines 40).

Regarding claims 36, 44 and 48, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 33, 42 and



Art Unit: 2168

46, Teare further discloses *the metadata is stored in eXensible Markup Language (XML) format* (Teare, Col. 6, Lines 26-34).

Regarding claims 37, 45 and 49, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 33, 42 and 46, Teare further discloses *the metadata is stored in Resource Description Framework (RDF) format* (Teare, Col. 6, Lines 35-39).

Regarding claim 38, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 33, Marques further discloses *the scanning tool is at least one spider* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34).

Regarding claim 39, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 33, Marques further discloses *the mapping tool is a domain ontology* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56).

Regarding claim 40, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 39, Marques further discloses *the domain ontology is a classification hierarchy* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56).

Regarding claim 43, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 42, Marques further

Art Unit: 2168

discloses *scanning the at least one information repository to collect keywords is performed by a spider* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34).

Regarding claim 47, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 46, Marques further discloses *scanning the at least a first and second website to collect keywords is performed by a spider* ((Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34).

**Claims 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marques [USP 6,182,066] and Teare et al. [USP 6,151,624] as applied to claim 33, and further in view of Becker [USP 6,301,579 B1].**

Regarding to claim 41, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 33, but fail to disclose *the mapping tool is a neural network*. Becker teaches a method for constructing a decision table classifier (Becker, Abstract). Becker further discloses neural network as a well-known type classifier (Becker, Col. 2, lines 7-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Marques and Teare system by including a neural network for classification in order to organize electronic documents for storage and subsequent retrieval.

***Allowable Subject Matter***


**Claim 35 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.**

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM T. VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
HUNG Q PHAM  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2168

March 20, 2006